Palestine Institute
of
Pacific School of Religion

BRITISH SCHOOL OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN JERUSALEM

BULLETIN No. 1

CONTENTS

PAGE

DIRECTOR'S FOREWORD: Professor J. GARSTANG, D.Sc. - - - - 1

HITTITE AND TROJAN ALLIES: W. J. PHYTHIAN-ADAMS, M.A. - - - 3

NEWS AND NOTES: EXCAVATION AND DISCOVERY - - - - - 8

Issued by the Council at 2 Hinde Street, London W. 1

1922

DIRECTOR'S FOREWORD

It is three years since the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem was founded and two years since we began active work in Palestine. We now commence the publication of an occasional Bulletin, in which there will appear, from time to time, studies by members and students, a summary of work done in the school or in connexion with it, a brief account of current research in Palestine and Syria, and any other information of general interest touching on the history and archaeology of the Holy Land.

These first years have been spent in preparation. Palestine as a field of special study was new to us whom the Committee had chosen to direct the School in its early years. Our work in the Hittite lands of N. Syria and Asia Minor on the one hand and in the Nile Valley on the other had indeed directed our thoughts as students to Palestine, but the archaeology of the land was known only indirectly through published material, notably that masterpiece of research and learning, the 'Canaan' of Père Vincent, and the accounts of isolated excavations made by the Palestine Exploration Fund and other bodies. For long Palestine has been to the historian only a frontier of Egypt, the pathway of armies, a battlefield of great nations and the birthplace of great religions; while the origins of the Canaanites and the Hebrews and the Philistines, their relations with one another and with the outer world, and the presence of Amorites and Hittites among them, have been regarded rather as matters of local interest, not likely to throw light upon the wider problems of racial migration and settlement, and the development of civilization. During this time we have been able to examine some of the problems upon the spot, to explore the ancient sites already so familiar in name, and to study afresh the links and clues provided by investigators in the past: the result is to convince us that our field of research was not only a battlefield of nations and the home of inspired thoughts, but it was in fact the meeting place of civilizations.

Palestine is geographically a focus upon which varied civilizations converged leaving trails in their passage—slender threads the ends of which lie buried in the soil. If then we can find these clues and trace them backwards step by step, with method and patience, they must lead us surely towards the solution of some of the most interesting historical problems of the day. The pursuit may take us far afield, and it is owing to the progress of research in the neighbouring lands of Asia Minor, Greece, Crete, Egypt, Mesopotamia and Babylonia, that the threads may now be traceable. Reciprocally the notable expansion of our knowledge of these surrounding areas during the last generation indicates Palestine as a natural centre for the task of co-ordinating the new evidence,—that further synthetic treatment, which now lies before us. And in Jerusalem the

student is happily placed. No horizon limits his vision. His neighbours are the historical lands of the Amorite and the Hittite and of Egypt ; to the West is the bright sea which through all time has attracted venturous ships that come and go, while to the east and south are vast areas of partial desert, that invite but efface the tracks of intercourse almost as effectively as does the sea.

It is in illustration of this outlook that from a series of studies for publication we have selected as the chief features of our first bulletin the short monograph which follows, on the Hittite and Trojan Allies, by Mr. W. J. Phythian-Adams. The theme is relatively modest : subjects like 'Caphtor' or the Philistines or 'Sisera' might have seemed to claim previous consideration. Its wide and special interest will, however, explain our choice. Briefly the author points out that a group of Hittite allies who fought in Syria with the Great King of Kheta against the Pharaoh Ramses II. reappear as Trojan allies a hundred years later. The fact itself is simple ; the lists from a study of which this result is derived have long been known, and no fresh archaeological evidence has been introduced. The conclusion was visible, almost obvious : only Greece and Egypt are each beyond the other's horizon ; while both areas must come within the purview of the student of Palestine, who brings the fact to light. And though the fact in itself is a simple one, the result is far reaching, and it opens up new vistas of historical possibilities. Not only are Egypt and the Greek world brought into contact by the land route, a thousand years before Alexander, but the door of Europe is opened to bands of heroes of Homeric type venturing before the close of the 2nd millenium B.C. as far as the Euphrates, the Jordan and the Nile. A notable step has been taken towards the solution of several problems, and a new light is thrown upon the intercourse of antiquity from which our civilization emerged. How fascinating now becomes the pursuit of the Philistine to his homeland, and how full of new hope the enquiry !

While this study has been based upon familiar materials, and no attempt is here made to develop its archaeological consequences, it helps to indicate the full range and interest of our new work in Palestine. This is one of the first-fruits, and it was ripe to pluck. But in general much serious spadework must be done before the ground of our local archaeology can be deemed adequately sifted. We must learn, by years of systematic and patient work, to recognise and to distinguish between the archaeological remains of the different racial elements that have contributed to found the civilization of the Holy Land. This is a complex problem with a worthy goal. We propose to examine a selection of historical sites from each area of settlement, to compare and map the results, so to determine the distribution of each type of archaeological remains, and to ascertain their relationship. The precious fragments of history in early Hebrew literature will help to interpret these results ; and we may hope then, but only then, to distinguish and locate the Canaanites, the Philistines, the Amorites, the Hebrews and the Hittites wherever in Palestine they have left their traces. Having in this way prepared our material, the next step will be to follow up each clue methodically by comparison with discoveries in other areas of research abroad. In this way students of Greece and Crete, of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, of Arabia and of Egypt will each and all find a field of interesting study in Jerusalem, where their help will be equally indispensable to the interpretation of results. This is not the programme of a year but for the future : others we hope will reap where we now sow. But each year will be filled with active work, and many moments will provide their special interest and charm. Hardly can any problem outside of the struggle for existence be of wider or more enduring interest than that of the complex civilization of this small tract, the Holy Land, wherein the most sacred associations of mankind are concentrated to an extent without precedent or parallel upon the globe.

We have spoken chiefly of our investigations of the early civilizations of Palestine, because that is the archaeological period most concerned in the study which here follows. In other branches of research, the Stone Age, the Graeco-Roman, Arab and Crusaders' periods, while the methods remain the same, visible material is more abundant and in general more readily accessible. Students desiring to specialize in one or other of these fields may approach their task confident of a great opportunity for original research, which the organization of the allied Schools of Archaeology in Jerusalem and the Department of Antiquities for Palestine will do all that is possible to facilitate.

1st June, 1922.

J. G.

HITTITE AND TROJAN ALLIES

1290-1190 B.C.

In 1287 B.C. the Egyptian Pharaoh Ramses II. fought a desperate and only partially successful campaign against a confederacy of tribes or nations from Asia Minor and Syria, under the leadership of the Great King of Kheta. A century later an Achaean host waged their famous 10 years war against a confederacy of tribes or nations in the N.W. corner of Asia Minor, under the leadership of Priam, king of Ilion (Troy). Between these two events so distant in time as well as in geographical space, there would seem, on the face of it, to be no natural connection, but a study of the lists of their enemies which by good fortune both the Egyptians and the Greeks have left us, brings out some interesting and perhaps significant points of resemblance.

The Catalogue in the Second Book of the Iliad gives us what is now generally admitted to be a faithful account of the allies who fought for Troy. With those on the distant Axius and Halys we are not now concerned ; we are interested only in a small group which lies for the most part in the Troad between the Sea of Marmora and the Gulf of Adramyttium.

This group contained the following members :—

(1) The Troes, we are told, were commanded as a body by Hector (*Il.* II. 816); but there were sub-divisions. (*a*) First there were the Dardanoi, who dwelt in the Scamander Valley under the spurs of Ida (II. 821. cf. *Il.* XX. 215-218). (*b*) Next were certain Troes living in the Aisepos Valley 'and commanded by Lukaon's glorious son, Pandaros, to whom Apollo himself gave the bow' (*Il.* II. 824-7). In two other passages (*Il.* V. 105, 173) this region is called Lukia (Lycia); and the name 'Lukaon' no less than the mention of Apollo Lukegenes, shows that this name has not been attached in error.

These Lycians were, of course, distinct from the people who inhabited the well-known district of that name in the South-West corner of Asia Minor; the latter are mentioned separately at the end of the Catalogue as being under the leadership of Sarpedon and Glaukos (II. 815-7). It is clear, nevertheless, that the two were intimately connected in much the same way as the Bretons were once connected with their kinsmen in Cornwall and Wales. Both were distinctively a race of bowmen and as such worshipped Apollo the lord of the bow; and it is probably by no accident that the name of Tloes was to be found in Southern Lycia (Strabo XIV. 3. 3 Steph. Byz.s.v. Tlos) and that the famous river of that region, the Xanthos, once had a namesake in the Troad (*Il.* XX. 74. Strabo XIII. 1.21). Finally, the usual Trojan war-cry, 'Ye Troes, Lukioi and Dardanoi' in which the Southern Lycians must, on any theory, be included, points to the existence of some special link between these three peoples and suggests a common origin or at least a common home in the past. Slight as this evidence is, it seems to support the view that the Southern Lycians had at some date broken away from the old confederacy, leaving behind them a remnant which became gradually merged in the surrounding tribes.

After the Aisepos valley, the Catalogue takes us round the coast South-Westwards and as no tribes are named we must assume that they were all called Troes. In *Il.* I. 840, however, we find,

(2) Pelasgoi inhabiting 'deep soiled Larisa' a tract which may be located at the North-West end of the Gulf of Adramyttium, (Troy pp. 198-213). Eastwards of them, as we learn from other passages in the *Iliad* (*Il.* VI. 34-5. XXI. 87) were certain

(3) Leleges, the name of whose capital was Pedasos. Strabo tells us that the Leleges were driven out by the captors of Troy and migrated to Caria where a district called Pedasis and a small town called Pedasum remained as a memory of them to his day (Strabo VII. 7. 2. XIII. 1. 50). Whoever these Leleges were, it is evident that the name Pedasos was so identified with them that it accompanied them persistently in their travels.

(4) East again from Pedasos lay Thebe held by a people called the Kilikes (Cilicians *Il.* II. 693. VI. 415).

(5) To the East of the Troad itself we find the Musoi (Mysians. *Il.* II. 858) and

(6) beyond them by the Ascanian Lake the Phruges (Phrygians. *Il.* II. 862).

(7) Finally, for our present purpose, we may note the Maiones (Maeonians. *Il.* II. 864) on the spurs of Tmolos.

The Trojan allies, then, who are of special interest in this enquiry are the following:—Troes, Dardanoi, Lukioi, Pelasgoi, Leleges of Pedasos, Kilikes, Musoi, Phruges, and Maiones.

We may now go back 100 years and consider the Hittite allies recorded by Ramses II. The poem of Pentaur (B.A.R. III. 306) opens with the following 'Beginning of the victory of King Usermare Setepnere (Ramses II.) . . . which he achieved in the land of Kheta and Naharin, in the land of Arvad, in Pedes, in the Derden, in the land of Mesa, in the land of Kelekesh—Carchemish, etc.'

Later on (B.A.R. 309) we have this list repeated with variations 'The chief of Kheta had come, having gathered together all countries from the ends of the Sea to the land of Kheta, which came entire: the Naharin, and Arvad, . . (lost), Mesa, Keshkesh, Kelekesh, Luka, Kezweden,

Carchemish, Kode, the land of Kadesh, Ekereth,' etc. In place of Mesa and Keshkesh the hieroglyphic texts have Pedes and a name which has been variously read as Yr-wn, Ariunna, Iliunna (Ilion ?), Ari-wen-na (Oroanda ?) and Ma-un-na (Maeonians ?)—(Hall p. 179).

A third reference (B.A.R. 312) speaks of the 'youth of the wretched Kheta together with its numerous allied countries: from Arvad, from Mesa, from Pedes, from Keshkesh, from Yr-wn-t (?) (for variations see above), from Kezweden, from Aleppo, Eketeri, Kadesh, and Luka.'

The first thing we have to note about the Hittite confederacy is that it has been collected '*from the ends of the Sea*,' a phrase meaningless if applied to the Eastern Mediterranean. Since Kheta occupied the great bend of the Halys and extended thence South-westwards to North Syria, it ought to follow that the most distant of its allies came either from the North, the North-East, or the North-West, coasts of Asia Minor, and that their names will be carefully recorded on the principle '*omne ignotum pro magnifico*.' The lists will therefore contain some Hittite names, some Syrian, and some belonging to people 'from the ends of the Sea' nor is it difficult to distinguish most of these from one another. Kheta, for instance, explains itself; Naharin, Carchemish, Arvad (Ruad), Ekereth (= the Ugarit of the Tell Amarna letters), Kadesh, Kode (= Phoenicia), Kezweden are all known to us from other sources and can be located without much hesitation. Not one of them is to be found West of the Halys; in fact all but one are in North Syria.

There remains a residue which we have now to study, namely:—Pedes, Derden, Mesa, Keshkesh, Kelekesh, Iliunna (or Mawanna or Arwanna) and Luka, which may be tabulated for comparison with our previous list of Trojans.

Homeric List	*Egyptian List*
Troes (of Ilion)	Iliunna (?)
Dardanoi	Derden
Lukioi	Luka
Pelasgoi of Larisa	
Leleges of Pedasos	Pedes
Kilikes of Thebe	Kelekesh
Musoi	Mesa
Phruges	
Maiones	(Mawunna* ?)
	Keshkesh

The resemblance between these two confederacies is surely too striking to be due to a pure coincidence. At the same time several points have obviously to be examined.

(1) The Pelasgoi of Larisa do not appear in the Hittite list, but as they were obviously an unimportant sub-division of the Trojans (they do not appear in the Catalogue and only incidentally elsewhere), this fact need not surprise us.

(2) The Phruges are likewise absent, but this is due to the fact that at the beginning of the 13th Century they had not yet arrived in Asia Minor. Priam, who speaks of their numbers, (*Il.* III. 187), mentions them in a tone which implies only a limited knowledge of their nation, and it is significant that on the only occasion on which he joined their army the common enemy were the Amazons, who presumably represent the remains of the Hittite Empire. In other words, we infer that between 1290 and 1190 B.C. an invasion of Phrygians burst into Asia Minor and helped to overthrow the ancient kingdom beyond the Halys, and from other sources we know this to be a historical fact.

(3) The Iliunna or Mawunna must still remain undetermined. The name, as we have seen, occurs with Pedes as a variation to Mesa and Keshkesh, The identification of Pedes with the Troadic Pedasos (*not* the Carian, since the migration of Leleges had not yet taken place) and

*[Very doubtful reading.—Ed.]

of Mesa with Musoi seems irresistible. It would appear reasonable, then, to locate Iliunna or Mawunna in the same geographical area, and either reading will enable us to do this (see above).

(4) The same argument should apply to Keshkesh, if this is not after all a scribe's error for Kelekesh. The identification of this place with the Gashga of the Boghaz Keui texts (Hrozny p. 157 f) seems at first sight attractive, but Gashga appears to have lain between the Halys and the Euphrates, (Hrozny p. 158) and Keshkesh, which we find in company with Mesa (Mysians) and Kelekesh (Cilicians), should surely be looked for in the neighbourhood of these peoples.

Can Keshkesh possibly be Kuzikos (Cyzicus) ? In support of this identification we can cite an exact parallel. The Libyan enemies of Ramses III., whom the Egyptians called Mesh-Wesh are identical (in name) with the later Libyan tribe of Mazyes or Maxyes and with the modern Berber Imazigh-en and Imushagh. (The dominant root is M - ż - gh Bates p. 42, 46 f). Thus, the termination -sh being the same in both cases, we have

M(e) - sh - w(e) - (sh) = M(a) - z - u - (es)
K(e) - sh - k(e) - (sh) = K(u) - z(i) - k - (os).

If this identification is accepted, we gain yet another ally whose home was in the Troad.

(5) As to the position of the Mesa, if these are the Mysians, there is no dispute. Close beside them, to the West, were the Kilikes who centred round Thebe. The country which was later to be known by their name, Cilicia, was at this date called Arzawa or Luvia (Forrer p. 21). The Assyrian 'Khilakku' belongs to a date long posterior to the Hittite war and the most reasonable supposition is that the body of Kelekesh who fought at Kadesh on the side of Kheta, settled, or were settled, in 'Cilicia' after that event. The remnant left behind in the Troad survived for a century more and then disappeared, just as the Lycians on the Aisepos vanished while their migrant kinsmen have preserved their name for all time in their new home.

(6) The identification of Luka with the Lukioi presents no difficulty nor does it affect our argument that we are unable to determine to which branch of that people the name refers. We have seen the special grouping of Troes, Lukioi, and Dardanoi, and we may assume that the causes or motives which brought Sarpedon and Glaukos into such close connection with the Troad would have been still more cogent a hundred years before.

At this point we touch the vital problem which underlies our argument. What created this North-West Anatolian confederacy ? What caused it after a century of alliance with Kheta to repudiate that alliance and range itself on the side of the Phrygian invaders ? What gave it such cohesion that it not only survived the wreck of the Hittite Empire but embraced in an unbroken chain the Southern Lycians and the Paconians of Macedonia ? What, in short, is the link between the Hittite allies of the thirteenth century and the league which fought for Priam at the siege of Troy ?

Briefly the answer is twofold, Race and Trade. All the known evidence (archaeological, geographical, linguistic and historical) goes to show the intimate connection which existed between the Troad, the Balkans, and the Danube valley. (For a detailed examination of these facts the reader is referred to the works mentioned in the bibliography).

This connection was due in the first place to the invasion of North-West Asia Minor by Danubian or Balkan tribes which made their way down the valleys of the Vardar or Maritza, crossed the Dardanelles or Bosphorus, and drove out or absorbed the original inhabitants of the Troad. These tribes can be traced by the survival of the parent body which they left behind. (cf. Ridgeway p. 351, 355, etc.) Thus in Roman times Dardani were to be found in Illyria (Strabo VII. 5. 7.) while a legend related the migration of Dardanus through Samothrace to Troy. Similarly the Brygi or Bryges in Thrace and Macedonia were well known to be of the same race as the Phrygians (Herodotus VII. 73. Strabo XII. 3. 20) and to have been left behind by them when they crossed to Asia. The Mysians and the Moesians on the Danube had once been one (*Iliad* XIII. 5, Strabo VII. 3. 2). The Bithynians came later from Thrace (Herod. VII. 75) and left behind them the Thyni. The Maeones of Lydia and the Paeones of Macedonia look back

to a common origin (Arkwright p. 62 and Note 133). Finally a study of Lycian and Phrygian names has revealed many interesting connections between Phrygia, Illyria, and Thrace. (Arkwright.)

The Eastward movement of these tribes was checked for a time on the frontiers of the Hittite Empire, and their invasion converted into an alliance. Trade followed migration. The doors of the mountains once unlocked, the new peoples of Western Asia Minor now looked back to their kinsmen in Europe and invited the commodities which they had enjoyed in their old homes. Amber from the far-off Baltic, gold and silver from the Paeonian mines of Pangaeum must have met in their passage to Asia the copper of Cyprus and the rich robes of Phoenicia. At one end the Paeonians, at the other the Lycians, Carians and Maeonians acted as middlemen between East and West. (Troy p. 312, p. 321 etc., Thallon p. 200), and in the centre at the junction of the land and sea-routes from the Danube to the Euphrates, from the Nile to the Axius, from Iolcos to Colchis stood Troy, the mart and the meeting place of this ancient world.

The league of kindred tribes, created at the first spontaneously by the need for united effort in a strange land, was perpetuated by the new impulse of commercial interests and when its integrity was threatened at the vital point by the rising ambitions of Greece, it rallied to that point and fought for its very life (cf. Troy p. 321). The complete disappearance of Troy after the Achaean victory is in itself a sufficient proof of the issues which were at stake in that momentous war.

May 27, 1922. W. J. P.-A.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Explanatory of the abbreviations used in the text here shown in the first column.

(Allen)	ALLEN, T. W.	'The Homeric Catalogue'—*Journal of Hellenic Studies.* 1910. Vol. XXX, p. 292.
(Arkwright)	ARKWRIGHT, W. G.	'Lycian and Phrygian Names.' *Journal of Hellenic Studies.* 1918. Vol. XXXVIII, p. 45.
(B.A.R.)	BREASTED, J. H.	'Ancient Records of Egypt.' 1906
(Bates)	BATES, O.	'The Eastern Libyans.' 1914
(Forrer)	FORRER, E.	'Ausbeute aus den Boghazkoi—Inschriften Mitteilungen des Deutschen—Orient Gesellschaft.' Nr. 61. p. 20.
(Hall)	HALL, H. R.	'Keftiu and the Peoples of the Sea.' *Annual of British School at Athens.* 1901-1902. Vol. VIII, p. 157.
(Hrozny)	HROZNY, F.	'Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazkoi 1 Lieferung.' 1919.
(*Il.*)	LEAF, W.	'The Iliad.' 1900.
(Ridgeway)	RIDGEWAY, W.	'The Early Age of Greece.' 1901.
(Thallon)	THALLON, I. C.	'Some Balkan and Danubian connections with Troy.' *Journal of Hellenic Studies.* 1919. Vol. XXXIX, p. 185.
(Troy)	LEAF, W.	'Troy—A Study in Homeric Geography.' 1912.

NEWS AND NOTES : EXCAVATION AND DISCOVERY

Beisan. The Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania resumed active excavation this Spring. Dr. Fisher has completed the plans of the two uppermost city layers of the great mound. On the top he uncovered some interesting mediaeval monastic buildings, and has now disclosed the foundations of a great ' rotunda ' of Byzantine age. Very large columns and other traces of good Roman work begin to appear. In section he has worked down to the period of the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties (c. 1500 B.C.) without nearing the bottom of the mound. His discoveries include an historical stela of the early XIXth Dynasty which may throw light on the foreign and local relations of the age, as well as a number of tombs of the same period, with a representative series of ceramics of the well-known types of the Late Bronze Age as found at Ascalon and elsewhere in Palestine and in Cyprus. The work is proceeding and merits the warmest congratulations both as to its method and its execution.

Beit Jibrin. An exceptionally fine mosaic pavement, reported by Mr. Champion, Governor of Hebron, during the winter, has been examined by members of the British and French Schools. Arrangements have now been made for a fuller excavation by the French School (Ecole Biblique) with the co-operation of the Department of Antiquities, commencing in July.

Tell el Ful. The American School under Dr. Albright has commenced excavation in this mound which lies just N.E. of Jerusalem. The great glacis has been exposed and may prove to be much older than had been supposed. The work will continue after the harvest.

Valley of the Jordan. Mr. Guy, Inspector of Antiquities, has examined 40 ancient mounds to the south of Beisan : 17 of these were unrecorded. He reports very early pottery from several of these sites.

Miscellanea. The expeditions from Chicago and Harvard that are to work at Megiddo and at Samaria respectively are not yet announced. The British School is making preparations to examine, in the autumn, Tell Harbaj and Tell Amr (the possible sites of Harosheth of the Gentiles and of Sisera's outpost) and the Palestine Exploration Fund will resume work in the vicinity of Ascalon. The Arab pottery found on the site of the great mosque which overlay Herod's Cloisters at Ascalon proves to include a number of rare and early fabrics comparable with those of Fustat and especially akin to specimens which M. de Lorey has recently recovered at Damascus.

In Syria work is mostly closed down for the summer. Early Egyptian objects continue to be reported from Byblos (Jebeil) where a land slide by happy chance disclosed a tomb and sarcophagus of great size, suggesting a non-human interment, accompanied by a deposit of alabaster and metal vases of special character. At Kedesh (Tell Nebi, Mindu), where a monument of Sety I. was found last year, work was still proceeding at the time these notes were written ; early pottery is reported. At Tyre massive masonry foundations have been uncovered on the approach to the former island, and there are abundant traces of activity of the period of Alexander and thereafter. No buildings of the earlier periods have been discovered as yet, and the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages are indicated by typical ceramic fragments.